DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 565 CG 005 353

AUTHOR Williamson, E. G.
TITLE The Roles of SPW in Reconstruction of Humane Society
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Duluth.
PUB DATE [70]
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS Activism, Administrative Personnel, *Human Development, *Humanism, Individual Needs, *Social Change, *Student Personnel Work, *Student Personnel Workers, *Student School Relationship, Student Teacher Relationship, Values

ABSTRACT

Societal reconstruction is necessary for the easing of forces destructive to human development. This is the task which each Student Personnel Worker (SPWer) faces. We must seek to do our part in eliminating these forces and to replace them with constructive ones. SPW was developed to meet this challenge and was innovated as an effort to individualize mass education in an effort to humanize personal development. We need to induce each student to strive for individual values within mass society. This has been the historic mission of SPW. Today, however, as we face new problems and stresses, we need to explore what forms of SPW need to be reorganized and what new services need to be developed. Some needed changes include: (1) research on human development; (2) a new emphasis on learning to think clearly; (3) a realization that violence is not a panacea for inequality; (4) the establishment of new forms of orientation (loyalty and moral commitment) to school and college; (5) the implementation of a joint faculty, administration, student redelineation of the functions, privileges, and authority, and relationships of all three components; and (6) a restructuring of service relationships to enhance the worth and dignity of all. (RSM)

ED039565

THE ROLES OF SPW IN RECONSTRUCTION OF HUMANE SOCIETY

E. G. Williamson
Dean of Students and Professor of Psychology (Ret.)
University of Minnesota

Such a major task requires the efforts of all, young and old, who are fully dedicated to societal reconstructionism. But why, if we agree on societal reconstruction as the moral obligation of each why do we revolt, so frequently violently, against society itself and thereby seek to destroy each other?

Research in human development may well yield new variables. But one can readily identify these vector forces presently producing resistance, bitterness and revolt - - if only for a very small percentage of young and old. Nevertheless such societal disturbance is upsetting for all of us. Societal reconstruction requires the easing and, if possible, the eventual elimination of those forces destructive of human development. This is the task which each SPWer faces and we should seek to do our part in eliminating these destruction forces and evolving counter constructive forces.

1. Earlier and often disruptive physical and psychological maturity in many dimensions of personality has brought some young abruptly face to face with this currently tangled world and its inequities and discrepancies. Instead of plunging into efforts to reconstruct society some have turned bitter, hostile, violent and destructive - - while others defensively turn to complacency, conformity and adjustment to the requirements of the system (establishment). Research is much needed as to causes.
2. Unrestrained freedom characterizes the many abrupt and revolution-. ary changes in Victorian morality (racism, murder, theft, drug addiction, alcoholism, sexual promiscuity, homosexuality).

CG005353

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

3. Continuous but intensifying struggle of the young for the authority traditionally exercised and heretofor (for too long!) reserved as the sole right of the tribal elders. Too readily do we blame permissiveness as <u>the</u> cause. But in part this generational revolt is youth's rejection of the dominance of the young by the old (Establishment), through child rearing in home and school.

But what about the contention that cultural anthropologists tell us that some inevitable form of conditioning does take place for <u>all</u> of us, peaceful or violent moulding according to the prevailing, complex and conflicting mores? Is it possible, or desirable, to escape all conditioning or moulding of our personalities, values, aspirations, etc., etc.? How shall we account for the generational gap of the sixties?

4. As perceived and experienced by the younger generations: competing and conflicting adult role models ("slick politics" and business manipulations) among the tribal leaders - - the "heroes" imitated by the young (in all nationalities and tribes).
5. Economic and political chaos as depicted vividly in conflicting interpretations through news media which saturate the environment of all everywhere.
6. Widespread contention that illegality (the breaking or disregarding of "bad" laws) as advocated by Thoreau, Ghandi, Martin Luther King justifies the French, Russian and German Revolutions, and the Irish and the India-Pakistan warfare in the name of religion. By specious illogic of youth, justification is thus found for their own destructiveness, violence, sit-ins or degradation as evidenced at Berkeley, Columbia, Cornell and many other campuses.

7. The Bestiality and Brutality of War as a model of degradation of human beings often thinly disguised and morally justified by so-called patriotism which masks the arrogance of supposed racial superiority for "us" and the lower social, economic, and moral status of "them" (the "enemy").
8. The continuous bombardment of all of us, especially the sensitive youth entering adulthood (for some) from protected childhood, by the power struggle and Machiavellian tactics of nations, and even communities, joining with others in continuous battles for this or that advantage.
9. In the literature of SDS and some other youth movements, there is clearly an acceptance of nihilism as a philosophy of life. One wonders if the advocates have turned in desperation to nihilism because of deprivation, despair, bitterness, hopelessness, et al and, in some cases, for some, a guilty defensive rejection of our modern life of abundance. No clear reason for its adoption is stated by any advocate except that the unholy mess of modern civilization ipso facto justifies wholesale destruction. No thought is given to what will replace our society; destruction justifies itself in the pious hope that Phoenix rises among its own ashes of destruction. Research on the causes of acceptance of this philosophic pessimism?

In spite of these overwhelming destructive forces of ancient and modern society, (see McNeil Rise of the West, 1963 for a depressing account of the ancient history of many of these destructive forces, with a millimeter of hopeful progress to cheer us eternal optimists!), nevertheless some individual men

and women do continue to struggle for human development of self and the young - - and this is the eternal hope that persists for societal reconstruction. For example, paralled in time with - - but from different sources within education - - SPW originated from human kindness and sympathy (Eugenie Leonard, 1956), but yet outside (complementary?) of the often bureaucratic sterility of the formal classroom curriculum, as a series of humanizing organized services for child and youth and to the end that each individual would be able to achieve maximum personal development through education - - without interruption because of financial need, inadequate housing, loneliness without friends, psychological handicaps, needed therapy and normal "fun" as relaxation from work, indecision of vocational choice, diversion from associalization (rejection of external restrictions imposed by adults, e.g., racism, poverty), etc., etc. Thus SPW was innovated as an effort to individualize mass education and thus to humanize development from child to youth. To be sure, historically Aristotle's Academy did come first in origin as the school's model but time of organization is surely not the only or most important criterion of relevancy of any activity or effort to aid young and old to strive to attain the good life and to become a liberally educated person.

A reading of the early record of SPW as found in the writings of Herbert and Ann Hawkes, D. G. Paterson, Cowley, Don Gardner, Don Shank, ACE SPW committee (1937), Lloyd-Jones, Feder, Blaesser, Brumbaugh, and countless others indicate that we have indeed achieved considerable "good" for many youth - - but of course as with every other social reconstruction effort more, much more, remains to be achieved (especially through research) - - and because of new societal problems as indicated by new revolts, racism, drug abuse, rock and roll congestions and aggregations, the pill, etc., etc. Indeed, this present decade of the 1960's has erupted violently with its own revolt against the traditional mores and

restraints of earlier times. But one needs constantly to be reminded that a minority of revolting adolescents has been depicted as universal by the modern news media. Indeed, one needs constantly to experience the "normal" child and youth today to defend oneself against overgeneralization and depression and despair. Nevertheless the small minority, while not representative, is still a terrible abuse of human potentiality and all educators, and inactive conforming (moulded)youth, need to renew efforts to reduce even the small percentage of serious deviates who may well emerge as adults (and their children) in serious need of complex therapy of a variety of efforts (dydactic counseling, T-group, group therapy, sensitivity, marathon, wet marathon, incarceration, and what not?) including new innovations that one hopes will emerge in the decades ahead.

One effort of counselors and many teachers deserves more attention than it usually receives even in the literature of SPW, including counseling. I cite as an example, the cultivation or effort to cultivate aspiration to become one of self respect and also of importance and respect to others. Perhaps this virtue of the good life is oftentimes achieved by means of the humanizing relationship of adults with the younger generation. It is evident that such a task is difficult to achieve, not only for those who are culturally deprived but often for those whose parental and familial status appear to be most affluent and most promising for self realization. It follows that each member of the new generation deserves and needs to experience some adults' efforts to help them cultivate self respect and aspiration to strive to live the good life. These tasks are indeed complimentary to the formal curriculum but not extra to the main task of education - - the cultivating of full humanity and the personal effects were sometimes transferred by students to the classroom learning required of child and youth across teaching that had become rigid and out-dated as is often true

of the curriculum inherited from the middle ages. What research will teach us methods of helping more students to "come alive" intellectually and humanely?

Indeed, it is not arrogant to assert that many a personnel worker can (but seldom does formally) document instances which clearly demonstrate that the so-called routine "service relationship" have often been experiences of students and clients as personally so vital, relevant and growth-impelling to the recipient that they have made possible a return to the classroom (intellectualism) in a better condition to profit from the opportunity to learn what is being taught by teachers. And indeed ofttimes that extra class assistance, humanizing as it was in its effect, added a mite to the stature of maturity of humaneness achieved by the child or youth. I contend that such relationships as services are not peripheral or auxilliary to the societal task of education - - the full attainment of humaneness of each student.

But it has become clear that for many, yes many, children and youth the classroom learning exercise and requirement are themselves sorely in need of revolutionary change in many aspects (research again as integral to SPW) - - to cite a few of its deficiencies. These are some of the major innovations needed in SPW of future years:

1. The SPW staff and "student leaders" and invited faculty (receptive to students as the raison d'etre of learning-teaching) should experience periodically and under "trained" leadership experience, Sensitivity, T-group or Laboratory training. Special invitations should be given to the campus ("trouble makers") advocates of YSA, SDS and others of that persuasion as well as those who relate affectively and effectively with the local "Establishment."

Care must be taken to avoid doctrine and other types of disruptive controversy. But the interaction must be sincere and penetrating and incisive. This is an effort to strengthen dissent but it is not a "sneaky" attempt to muffle dissent.

This is what I have in mind when I urge that SPWers learn (become acceptable) to "fraternize" with the "troublemakers" of this decade who insist in aerating vigorously those unsolved problems of unreconstructed societal problems I have named repeatedly. We should not be intimidated by timidity to argue, rationate and converse with those who feel bitter about racism, poverty, and other defects of our culture - - which are correctable if we seek rational solutions.

2. Bureaucratic rigidity and impersonality of application of requirements of curriculum requirements as applied to and required by each learner by bureaucratic staff (including some teachers!). We SPWers must help through continuous research to innovate "fresh" new teaching-learning-methods, increasing in the community and outside our country in alternative cultures.
3. I shudder when I observe anywhere formality of teacher-student relationship. We need constantly to remind ourselves that historically, as well as clinically, learning takes place <u>best</u> in the warm personal relationship of teacher and student - - with each continuously, developmentally, striving to stimulate and achieve learning as a style of living similar to the best patterns of child and parent relationship.

4. In the U.S.A. we are a "working people"; indeed job committed as a major life goal and the school is at all stages and ages increasingly job-oriented and committed and evaluated by that criterion - - "What good will that subject do me for a job?" This vocational motivation may well prove to be maturity inducing. Thus for some students the many other dimensions of human experience (other than formal content of the curricula) must be learned and exercised, if at all, "outside" the classroom context and often under other "teachers" than those committed to curriculum and vocational preparation, important though that is both in our economy and in our search for the good life of justice, beauty, and truth.

I repeat again - - each student and teacher as well as counselor needs to rededicate himself (and also "conforming youth") to the unfinished societal reconstruction begun by John Dewey (and other) if we are ever to achieve the "good life" for each and all. The formal curriculum and classroom learning are but one means of achieving full humanity in our form of human society.

I recall that Dewey sought to change the school curriculum (learning content) from the musty and irrelevant middle age classical curriculum (for the elite only) of an agrarian society weighted down with the classical (Roman-Greek) curriculum, to the 20th Century society of industrialization now presently turned into impersonal-depersonalized urban civilization. We thus face new obstacles to furthering human development through school and other experiences outside of the classroom.

In spite of all these societal obstacles we must strive to attain the goal which the ancient Greeks called the "good life" and we need to induce each student to strive for individualized values within mass society as the modern form of the "good life."

How do we strive to do this? Clearly the record shows that this has been our historic mission through SP services, as well as the dedicated purpose of many, many teachers and others of influence.

But today as we face these new problems and stresses, we need to explore what forms of SPW need to be reorganized. What new "services" need to be organized?

1. Research needs to become an established SPW service on human development, especially problems of the young.
2. I would note as a new SP service of high priority, we need to "teach" the errors (clearly evident in the young and old) of thinking, by means of our many service relationships with youth: How shall we achieve these internal changes in rational thinking? By formal courses in logic required of all, by advanced courses and reading in child-adolescent-adult development as rich, fully humane beings? By intensive extra-"class" in experiences with minority and deprived humans living in the ghettos? What else?

For one example of error of reasoning I cite the either/or (bi-polarity) error of glibly ascribing all societal evils and causes to "The Establishment." Also we need to aid ourselves and youth to be wary of the error of overgeneralizations (error of sampling) based upon "hearsay" rather than the hard-headed facts of verified evidence, and so we too (as "teachers") can utilize our "service"

and other extracurricular services as teaching-learning exercises. to learn to think rationally rather than emotionally is clearly requisite to societal reconstruction in which humanity may emerge as the resultant.

3. How shall we "teach" that violence is not corrective of inequality but is destructive and degrading of persons, both those who commit it and those who receive it? By visiting Watts, et al? or Columbia or Vietnam or India-Pakistan?
4. How indeed may we all learn vividly that some form of benign authority (moulding) is necessary to avoid anarchy (Rousseau's noble savage) in which all is lost (autonomy) for everyone for a heavy price. And here the dialect begins about external restraints on "freedom" as it has continued for six milleniums or more without complete solution - - but to be sure with much gain and enrichment.
5. Again, how may we all learn that revolutions and destructions are not the most effective or least costly form of societal reconstruction? Surely we can be more innovative than Charles Lamb's tale of how the Chinese discovered roast pig through the accidental burning of barns!
6. Most difficult of all, what can we do to demonstrate to the nihilists that some form of moulding of character or otherwise "conforming" to of each (external restraints) is inherently necessary to achieve "full" (not absolutism of freedom!) humanity for all? To learn the fact of life that attainment of, not for a ruling elite or color tribe, but for all, humane selves is the foundation of civilization - - so I believe.

7. Can we learn to converse seriously, and in depth, with revolting youth about the "possibility" that the Establishment (or parents, or deans even) is not inherently and completely degrading of each individual's search for the "good life"?
8. And how on earth may we SPWers perfect techniques persuasive of the possibility, if not conclusion, that racial and political hierarchy (all forms of arrogance and superarrogation) are destructive and corruptive of all as is financial degradation or poverty?
9. It seems reasonable that experience, direct experience and not merely classroom and textbook, is capable of persuading (teaching-learning) young and old that clear thinking (rationality) is necessary as style of living the "good life." Therefore learning to identify and avoid these and other errors of illogic is as serious a necessity as avoidance of excessive and abusive authority and socially degrading morality. We need jointly with youth, gently and firmly, to identify some of the errors of thinking that, uncorrected, will later emerge as arrogance and dogma that degrade others into supine passivity or to low status in our social hierarchy (e.g., reification" as though the "word" - authority has real existence and as well as authoritarianism - - as though they were a universal and unitary genetic trait of some!).
10. More positively we, SPW and teacher alike, should seek assiduously that each youth is joyfully inducted into the historic mission of full humanity - - not merely his own tribe or country and even

his preparation for a job. This should be the impact of orientation both in school and college - - not for bureaucratic or academic orderliness but for the sheer delight of joining the universal human enterprise! We need to abandom our yield to the 20th Century conviction of our own superiority of "us" (family, friends, tribes, etc.) and our false justification for "privatism" (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969) or narrow and superficial adherence to "our" tribe, our cosmology, our way of life as the superior one above all others! We must learn that we are but one among many cultures - - no more America First Isolationism!

11. In addition to new content in SPW (especially research as SPW!) and new emphasis in learning to think clearly and new forms of orientation (loyalty - moral commitment) to school (beginning in kindergarten) and college, there needs to be, school by school and college by college, a major, painful but continuously joint faculty-administration-student re-delineation of the functions, privileges and authority and relationship of all three components. (Foote, Mayer, et al, 1968; Williamson, 1961)

While the (school and college) administrative hierarchy remains stable by law, until changed, the experienced relationships are in need of radical change so that the student is not perceived and self-perceived as low man on the totem pole. I constantly remind myself of what our President Wilson said so many times: "Students are the real reason for the University."

The form of change in the delineation of relationships and service, teaching and education functions, will vary from school to school and college to college. The experimental search for new forms of maturing relationships leading to full humanity with everyone serving as a learner will be itself a delightful and maturing experience for all - - if conducted within the exercise of benign authority rather than through authoritarian exercise of authority which degrades students and, as well, those in authority.

12. Note! I am not arguing the case for continuing many of the parietal rules that should have been modified without rebellions, although some freedoms of excess <u>do</u> degrade the student. But wise and continuous consultation about the maturing effects of some behavior should have made revolts unnecessary - - were we not as rigid in our clinging to the "old" rather than seeking rationally for those changes in mores and morals that facilitate maturity and full humanity. But it seems that we humans will never learn and apply to ourselves John Gardner's dictum about the "Ever Renewing Society" (without a French or Russian revolution!).

Thus, I do not favor any one component of the university community (students, faculty, administration-trustees) becoming the dominant single one exercising authority over others.

That is, for instance, I do not favor "student power" as autonomous nor faculty power, nor trustee power, unilaterally exercised.

Of course we give obeisance to the legal hierarchy of power structure but there must be continuous growth-producing involvement of all components in the decision making of the school and later of the adult society itself.

This is a requirement for human development even though the school and societies charters give ultimate power and authority to specified groups of individuals. That is, continuous consultation must be the form of decision making as is the contemporary power-authority structure-function within some modern large industrial organizations (Barnard, 1948; McGregor, 1967).

It follows, for me, that this means that SPW must be in continuous consultation with administrators, students and faculties about conditions and content of learning to strive to attain the "good life."

This is the only form of power-authority that will lead to maturity of students and full participation by faculty as teacher-learner and personnel worker as facilitator of maturity.

Indeed, for me, this is the form of intra-institutional "revolt" (restructured relationship) that will attain for students their rightful function in management of the school or college (with due modifications for age and maturity).

Otherwise students will continue to battle fruitlessly for power and authority to <u>replace</u> administration-trustees and faculty. Unhappily, history is full of instances that illustrate that they will never achieve full autonomy (at least for long) but only in episodes

and fragments with frightful degredation of the school or college, and of the students as a component of the school and college community.

13. To turn again to the needed reformation of modern SPW, within such a social-organization of school I firmly assert that every "service" relationship - - teaching and SPW - - offers/provides opportunity for "developmental" thrust or influence toward maturity and human potentiality; e.g., loans may be the opening wedge for humanizing and maturing relationships which are truly developmental and therefore educative beyond mere financial subsistence. That is, I am unconvinced of the effectiveness of designating and organizing some student-staff-faculty relationships as "growth producing" and others as routine, bureaucratic formalities that depersonalize those who serve and those who receive such "services."

To be sure, loans and other services can deteriorate to the form of bureaucratic and depersonalized, therefore uneducational, relationships. This can also occur with all other personal services, as well as within the classroom itself. But all these forms of relationships may be restructured to become maturing motivations and aspirations. This is the task of the future years.

This is the wave of the future SPW as I see it, to restructure all of our service relationships so that they enhance the worth and dignity of each student, staff and all. This revolution requires retraining ourselves and each new generation of students in attitudes and relationships so that each strives to achieve

the "good life." In this way we in the school through its successive generations of staff, teachers and students seek to reconstruct society toward the goal of humanizing all of its members. Such a revolution requires intellectual innovation, effective maturity and dedication to humanity as a whole and to each individual member. This dictum applies equally to teachers as well as to student personnel workers.

14. With all of us face-to-face with the current (and historic) cosmic tragedies, how can we "teach" (induce) youth "to face up" to such unsolved problems of humanity and thus to accelerate maturity by turning away from such "trivial" youth(!) matters as visitation of women's hours, drug abuse, the cyclical struggle for autonomous freedom from "in loco parentis"? Will youth then mature into manhood if they are free from all external parental and collegiate restraint?

These are the persisting and hagging problems that I cannot get on the agenda of confrontation and agressive dialogue. But I derive some comfort and confidence from a phone call from an older age alumnus who admonished me (facetiously?) that, now that his daughter was under my care (in loco parentis) he expected me to require her to obey all the rules and regulations he had railed against when he was subject to my authority! Perhaps - by midage?

As a postscript let me recall an instance exemplefying that the confict of value commitment may arise among anyone who works with child and youth. I refer to the sprich worten of some educators who have exerted much influence upon the nature, concepts and scope of modern SPW and education. I have already

referred to John Dewey and his grand strategy of societal reconstruction through the school as the instrumentality of "wholeness" of human development. (see also Harold Taylor, 1968)

Now I recall for those who have read the historical background some other prophets of pre-Parsons' history not known to many who do not read such literature.

Somewhere in his voluminous writings Robert Hutchins declared (pontificating as did Zeus from Mount Olympus, and committing the obvious bipolarity error of fragmentation of the wholeness of humanness) that the school should limit its mission to things intellectual and leave morality to the home and church! As a rejoinder, while one honors Cardinal Newman for his dictum (among others) about the "supremacy of the intellect," yet to read Newman is to be reminded rather of the ancient dictum of the sound mind in a sound body (not a disembodied intellect). Years previously, unread by Hutchins (?), our fellow SPWer, W. H. Cowley, ennunciated the counter dictum (much as did the ancient Greeks) that SPW should take as its mission maturing the "whole" individual, not just the cerebral cortex or, more recently, the viscera (Freud) and he borrowed from General Smuts (South Africa) the word "holoism" to define the whole child much in the fashion of John Dewey, Montessori, Taylor and others of that persuasion.

Another obiter dictum of Hutchins' type about the unitary function of higher education, at least, is to be found in Robert A. Nesbit's "Is There a Crisis of the University?" in the Public Interest, No. 10, Winter 1968. Nesbit dismisses "The ligitimacy of individual development or personal values" as the purpose or function of the university and he derides the old "life adjustment" as the antithesis of the university's purpose.

It is indeed a delightful relief to read a counter-dictum that "learning should be regarded not as an isolated classroom experience, but rather as a sustained, continuous, public experience." (Foote, Mayer, et al, 1969)

Isn't it quite clear by now after decades of derision that SPW (now characterized as the bureaucracy!) (Foote, Mayer, et al) is indeed for some <u>extra</u> to the classroom learning and that there is little likelihood that SPW will be accepted as legitimate in higher education by many, many faculty? To be sure, we have attained the classification by some as useful like yardsmen and janitors but surely not relevant to the real purpose of the curriculum teaching (professor)?

Our grand strategy should be not to disguise ourselves as an integral part of that kind of narrow education as intellectualism but two fold in legitimacy and relevancy: (1) to aid those who need our "services" (loans, housing, recreation, counseling - - in <u>all</u> relationships - - about their real substantial <u>human</u> needs): (2) to turn our innovative capacities to providing the type of education as striving for humane maturity as so poignantly revealed in the <u>research</u> on the young of Farnsworth, Sanford, Katz, Keniston and a host of other intellectually competent and scholarly researchers of students in the process of seeking to become adults - - hopefully humane.